

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 1, 2006. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 12-15 are pending. Claims 4, 9 and 11 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 10, 13 and 14 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 1, 13 and 14 are in independent form.

Claims 1 and 3-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,336 (*Ladd et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,686 (*Chung et al.*), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,597 (*Lin*). Since Claims 4, 9 and 11 have been canceled, the rejection of those claims is moot.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection of the other claims over the prior art, the independent claims have been amended. Applicants submit that the amended independent claims are allowable over the cited art, for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, extracting a first attribute value of a first predetermined tag in a document obtained by document obtaining means as rule identification information; selecting a rule corresponding to the extracted rule identification information from among a plurality of rules, and selecting a predetermined one of the plurality of rules if the first predetermined tag is not contained in the obtained document; and extracting a second attribute value of the first predetermined tag as the voice output contents and text surrounded by second predetermined tags as the voice input candidates if

the selected rule is a first rule, and extracting text in a range from a head to a third predetermined tag in the document as the voice output contents and anchors in the range as the voice input candidates if the selected rule is a second rule. Each of Claims 13 and 14 recites similar or identical subject matter.

*Ladd et al.* relates to a voice browser for interactive services and methods thereof. *Ladd et al.* teaches that a parse unit 302 parses information received from a network fetcher unit 300 based on syntax rules of a markup language, and an interpreter unit 304 determines a next state or step based on a dialogue and information input by a user (see col. 12, lines 18-20, col. 13, lines 55-59, and col. 16, lines 12-18). Nothing in *Ladd et al.* is understood to teach or suggest the above-noted recitations of independent Claim 1, especially extracting a second attribute value of the first predetermined tag as the voice output contents and text surrounded by second predetermined tags as the voice input candidates if the selected rule is a first rule, and extracting text in a range from a head to a third predetermined tag in the document as the voice output contents and anchors in the range as the voice input candidates if the selected rule is a second rule.

*Chung et al.* relates to a hyper text mark up language document to speech converter. *Chung et al.* teaches that a HTML parser 24 parses a HTML document file 23 to generate HTS control rules (col. 6, lines 19-20). However, nothing in *Chung et al.* is understood to teach or suggest the above-noted recitations of independent Claim 1, especially extracting a second attribute value of the first predetermined tag as the voice output contents and text surrounded by second predetermined tags as the voice input candidates if the selected rule is a first rule, and extracting text in a range from a head to a

third predetermined tag in the document as the voice output contents and anchors in the range as the voice input candidates if the selected rule is a second rule.

*Lin* relates to an electronic shopping agent capable of operating with vendor sites having disparate formats. *Lin* teaches that information from queries is filtered, parsed and mapped to a standard format. Information from merchant sites can be parsed and filtered and mapped using a hierarchical tree structure. However, nothing in *Lin* is understood to teach or suggest the above-noted recitations of independent Claim 1, especially extracting a second attribute value of the first predetermined tag as the voice output contents and text surrounded by second predetermined tags as the voice input candidates if the selected rule is a first rule, and extracting text in a range from a head to a third predetermined tag in the document as the voice output contents and anchors in the range as the voice input candidates if the selected rule is a second rule.

Since the documents cited in the Office Action, whether taken singly or in combination (even assuming, for the sake of argument, that such combination were permissible), do not teach or suggest all of the elements of any of Applicants' independent claims, those claims are believed allowable over those documents. Withdrawal of the rejection under Section 103 is therefore respectfully requested.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. These claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the

same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas W. Pinsky/

---

Douglas W. Pinsky  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DWP/klm

DC\_MAIN 26727v1